

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
WESTERN DIVISION

LLOYD BROWN,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
VS.	)	No. 17-2123-JDT-cgc
	)	
JUANITA HOLLOWAY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

---

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO COMPLY WITH 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(2)  
OR PAY THE \$400 CIVIL FILING FEE

---

On February 21, 2017, Plaintiff Lloyd Brown, who is incarcerated at the Northwest Correctional Complex in Tiptonville, Tennessee, filed a civil complaint accompanied by a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (ECF Nos. 1 & 2.)

Under the Prison Litigation Reform Act (“PLRA”), 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(a)-(b), a prisoner bringing a civil action must pay the filing fee required by 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a). Although the obligation to pay the fee accrues at the moment the case is filed, *see McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 605 (6th Cir. 1997), *partially overruled on other grounds by LaFountain v. Harry*, 716 F.3d 944, 951 (6th Cir. 2013), the PLRA provides the prisoner the opportunity to make a “down payment” of a partial filing fee and pay the remainder in installments. § 1915(b)(2). However, in order to take advantage of the installment procedures, the prisoner must properly complete and submit to the district court, along with

the complaint, an *in forma pauperis* affidavit containing a current certification by the prison trust account officer and a copy of his trust account statement for the six months immediately preceding the filing of the complaint. § 1915(a)(2).

In this case, the affidavit submitted by Plaintiff is not accompanied by a certified copy of his trust account statement.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED to submit, within 30 days after the date of this order, either the entire \$400 civil filing fee<sup>2</sup> or a copy of his trust account statement for the last six months.<sup>3</sup> If Plaintiff needs additional time to file the required document, he may request one 30-day extension of time from this Court. *McGore*, 114 F.3d at 605.

If Plaintiff timely submits the necessary document and the Court finds that he is indeed indigent, the Court will grant leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and assess a filing fee of \$350 in accordance with the installment procedures of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b). However, if Plaintiff fails to comply with this order in a timely manner, the Court will deny leave to

---

<sup>1</sup> Attached to Plaintiff's *in forma pauperis* affidavit is a document titled "Important Notice to Prisoners" that attempts to explain to an incarcerated plaintiff how to obtain pauper status under the PLRA. (ECF No. 2-1.) It is unclear where the notice originated. However, while the notice does refer to the requirement that prisoners submit a copy of their trust account statement, Plaintiff did not actually attach the statement.

<sup>2</sup> Twenty-eight U.S.C. § 1914(a) requires a civil filing fee of \$350. In addition, § 1914(b) requires the clerk to "collect from the parties such additional fees . . . as are prescribed by the Judicial Conference of the United States." The Judicial Conference has prescribed an additional administrative fee of \$50 for filing any civil case, except for cases seeking habeas corpus and cases in which the plaintiff is granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Therefore, if Plaintiff is ultimately granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in accordance with the PLRA, he will not be responsible for the additional \$50 fee.

<sup>3</sup> Plaintiff does not need to submit another *in forma pauperis* affidavit.

proceed *in forma pauperis*, assess the entire \$400 filing fee without regard to the installment payment procedures, and dismiss the action without further notice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), for failure to prosecute. *McGore*, 114 F.3d at 605.<sup>4</sup>

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ **James D. Todd**  
JAMES D. TODD  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>4</sup> Even a voluntary dismissal by Plaintiff will not eliminate the obligation to pay the filing fee. *McGore*, 114 F.3d at 607; *see also In re Alea*, 286 F.3d 378, 381 (6th Cir. 2002).